



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,961	04/15/2004	Dennis W. Minium JR.	MS307028.1/MSFTP636US	7470
27195 7590 10/05/2007 AMIN. TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP 24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET CLEVELAND, OH 44114			EXAMINER HOFFLER, RAHEEM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2165	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/05/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
osteuball@thepatentattorneys.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/824,961

Applicant(s)

MINIUM ET AL.

Examiner

Raheem Hoffer

Art Unit

2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-16,19-28 and 30-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-16,19-28 and 30-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2 August 2007 has been entered. Due to Amendment, Claim rejections under 35 USC 101 pertaining to Claims 1-16 & 28 have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "...a computer readable storage medium..." in the body of the claim, yet "a computer readable storage medium" is not mentioned within the Specification. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims 27 and 32 both make reference to a "computer readable medium".

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 9-12, 14-15, 18, 20-21, 23-28, and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Gargi et al (USPG-Pub No. 20050027712A1).

As for Claim1, Gargi et al teaches of a distributed classification system comprising a plurality of unrelated software components stored in a computer readable storage medium and executable by a processing device (see Fig. 15; e.g., object types; (see paragraph [0096][0105][0113])) and a classification component that couples the unrelated software components to a common classification structure based on a structure type comprising structure type class, node types and structural constraints (see paragraph [0012], [0072-0076]; whereas Gargi et al teaching of clusters, meta data and hierarchy is equivalent to Applicant's teaching of hierarchy, class and constraints), the structural constraints define the permissible parent-child relationship between the various type nodes and wherein a plurality of applications access the software

Art Unit: 2165

components.(see Fig. 13 (12); e.g., object manager; (see paragraph [0038-0039][0043][0045-0047][0049][0103-0104])).

As for Claim 3, Gargi et al teaches the classification structure is hierarchical (see Fig. 8; e.g., XML; see paragraph [0012], [0074-0076]).

As for Claim 4, Gargi et al teaches the software components are associated with classification nodes (see Fig. 16 (60); see paragraph [0106][0107]).

As for Claim 6, Gargi et al clearly teaches a graphical user interface is employed by a user to classify software components (see paragraph [0042][0081][0083] and [0084]).

As for Claim 7, Gargi et al clearly teaches a user drags and drops components onto a classification node (see Fig. 2 (164) e.g., layout engine; see paragraph [0085]).

As for Claim 9, Gargi et al clearly teaches a notification component that notifies consumers of the common structure of proposed changes to the structure to give them an opportunity to veto the change (see Fig. 16 (62-78); (see paragraph [0107][0108][0112] and [0114])).

As for Claim 10, Gargi et al clearly teaches a notification component that alerts consumers of the common structure of a change (see Fig. 16 (62-78); (see paragraph [0107][0108][0112] and [0114])).

As for Claim 11, Gargi et al teaches a software tool interaction system comprising a means for generating a common classification scheme amongst a plurality of unrelated software tools stored in a computer readable storage medium, wherein the classification is based on a structure type and comprises structure type class, node types and structural constraints, the structural constraints (see paragraph [0012], [0072-0076]; whereas Gargi et al teaching of clusters, meta data and hierarchy is equivalent to Applicant's teaching of hierarchy, class and constraints) define the permissible parent-child relationship between the various node types; (see Fig. 15; e.g., object types; (see paragraph [0096][0105][0113])) and a means for maintaining the common classification scheme to provide a foundation for a cohesive user experience and wherein the plurality of tools access the components. (see Fig. 17 (120); e.g., Business Process Cockpit; (see paragraph [0013][0043][0110][0112] and [0114])).

As for Claim 12, Gargi et al clearly teaches of a user generating a classification scheme employing a graphical user interface (see paragraph [0042][0081][0083] and [0084]) to drag and drop artifacts onto classification nodes (see Fig. 2 (164) e.g., layout engine; see paragraph [0085]).

Claims 14 and 15 differ from Claims 9 and 10 in that claims 14 and 15 are software tool interaction system whereas claims 9 and 10 are classification system claims. Thus, claims 14 and 15 are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 9 and 10 above.

As for Claim 16, Gargi et al teaches a common classification methodology comprising generating one or more taxonomies comprising defining node types, structure type classes and structural constraints, wherein the parent-child relationship between the various node types is specified by the structural constraints; (e.g., segmentation engine; (see paragraph [0045-0047] and [0049])), maintaining the taxonomies to facilitate interaction with taxonomy artifacts by a plurality of unrelated tools (see paragraph [0043][0044][0047] and [0049]).

Claims 20 and 21 differ from Claims 6 and 7 in that claims 20 and 21 are method claims whereas claims 6 and 7 are system claims. Thus, claims 20 and 21 are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 6 and 7 above.

As for Claim 23, Gargi et al teaches maintaining the taxonomies (e.g., clusters or groups; see paragraph [0049]) includes notifying a user or owner of classifiable artifacts of changes to the taxonomy (see Fig. 16 (64); see paragraph [0107]).

As for Claim 24, Gargi et al teaches a before change event is raised prior to a change to provide owners with an opportunity to veto proposed changes (Fig. 16 (62-78); (see paragraph [0107][0108][0112] and [0114])).

As for Claim 25, Gargi et al teaches an after change event is raised to all owners to enable them to reflect a change that has been completed (Fig. 16 (62-78); (see paragraph [0107][0108][0112] and [0114])).

As for Claim 26, Gargi et al clearly teaches the taxonomy is represented in XML (see paragraph [0043]).

As for Claim 27, Gargi et al teaches a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer executable instructions for carrying out the method of claim 16 (see paragraph [0041]).

As for Claim 28, Gargi et al teaches a common enterprise classification scheme methodology comprising instantiating a common structure based on a structure type, the common structure comprising structure type class, node types and structural constraints (see paragraph [0012], [0072-0076]; whereas Gargi et al teaching of clusters, meta data and hierarchy is equivalent to Applicant's teaching of hierarchy, class and constraints), the structural constraints define the permissible parent-child relationship between the various node types; (see Fig. 15; e.g., object types; (see

paragraph [0096][0105][0113])); exposing the common structure amongst a plurality of unrelated tools to provide a foundation for a cohesive user experience and wherein the plurality of tools access the components. (see Fig. 8; (see paragraph [0013][0043][0080] & [0098])).

Claim 30 differs from claims 6 and 20 in that claim 30 is a common enterprise classification scheme method whereas claim 6 is a system and claim 20 is a common classification method claim. Thus, claim 30 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 6 and 20 above.

As for Claim 31, Gargi et al clearly teaches requesting consent from consumers of the common structure to proposed changes to the structure (see Fig. 16 (62-78); (see paragraph [0107][0108][0112] and [0114])).

As for Claim 32, Gargi et al clearly teaches a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer executable instructions for carrying out the method of claim 28 (see paragraph [0041]).

Claim Rejection – 35 USC 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 8, 13, 19, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gargi et al (USPG-Pub No. 20050027712A1) in view of Omoigui et al (USPG-Pub No. 20030126136A1).

As for Claim 5, Gargi et al teaches of organizing a collection of objects through the use of a hierarchical structure consisting of object types, classification nodes, a graphical user interface, and a segmentation engine (e.g., taxonomy engine). Gargi et al fails to explicitly teach of a globally unique identifier (GUID) being incorporated into his art. Omoigui et al teaches of a globally unique identifier (see paragraph [0982]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined a globally unique identifier as taught by Omoigui et al with the organizing a collection of objects as taught by Gargi et al because it is a preferable file naming method, as made hackneyed in the state of the art. (Omoigui et al (USPG-Pub No. 20030126136A1); see paragraph [0982]).

As for Claim 8, Gargi et al teaches of the classification component utilizing statistical analysis related to artificial intelligence to couple software components to the common structure (see Fig. 17 (120); e.g., Business Process Cockpit; (see paragraph [0043][0110][0112] and [0114])). Gargi et al fails to explicitly recite the limitation of heuristics. Omoigui et al teaches heuristics to couple software components to a

common structure (see paragraph [0622][1048]).

Claim 13 differs from Claim 8 in that claim 13 is a software tool interaction system whereas claim 8 is a classification system claim. Thus, claim 13 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 8 above.

As for Claim 19, Gargi et al teaches of node (e.g., classification nodes; see paragraph [0106][0107]) in a taxonomy (e.g., object cluster or group; see paragraph [0049]). Gargi et al fails to explicitly teach of a globally unique identifier (GUID) being incorporated into his art. Omoigui et al teaches of a globally unique node identifier (see paragraph [0982]).

Claim 22 differs from Claims 8 and 13 in that claim 22 is a method claims whereas claim 8 is a distributed classification and claim 13 is a software tool interaction system claim. Thus, claim 22 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 8 and 13 above.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raheem Hoffler whose telephone number is (571) 270-1036. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffery Gaffin can be reached on (571) 272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RH

 9/27/07
Raheem Hoffler


JEFFREY GAFFIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100